



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,364	12/18/2001	Muljadi Sulistio	CMRC 1007-1	8064

22470 7590 03/08/2005

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P O BOX 366
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER

STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/026,364

Applicant(s)

SULISTIO ET AL.

Examiner

Kyle R Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12.11.02, 26.7.02
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final action is in response to the application filed 27 December 2001 and the Information Disclosure Statements filed 26 July 2002 and 12 November 2002.
2. Claims 1-42 are pending. Claims 1 and 30 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statements (IDS) are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

4. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

The applicant fails to number the claim indented after claim 41. This claim has been renumbered 42.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2178

6. Claim 5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The term "DOM" in claim 5 is used by the claim to mean "data-object-model", while the accepted meaning, according to the W3C is "document object model." The term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogbuji ("Validating XML with Schmatron," 2000) in further view of Harold et al. (XML in a Nutshell, 2001, hereafter Harold).

As per dependent claim 1, Ogbuji discloses a method for updating a self-describing, structured document, the method including:

Art Unit: 2178

- Receiving a character string including one or more sets of:
 - A path specification identifying a node at which the update operator is to be applied (page 3, paragraph 5: Here, XPath is a path specification identifying a node for update)
- Accessing a self-describing, structured document (page 1, paragraph 1: Here, accessing a XML document for validation includes accessing a self-describing, structured document)
- Updating the document with the update values at the path specification (page 4, paragraph 2: Here, a template is created through the update of a Schematron document)

Ogbuji fails to specifically disclose:

- Receiving a character string including one or more sets of:
 - An update operator
 - One or more update values
- Parsing the character string

Harold discloses:

- Receiving a character string including one or more sets of:
 - An update operator (page 7, section "Wildcards": Here, a wildcard can be used to determine nodes to have a template applied)
 - One or more update values (page 7, section "Wildcards": Here, the template @* is applied to the nodes specified)

- Parsing the character string (page 1, paragraph 1: Here, the expressions in the XPath string is parsed in order for XPath operations to occur on a specified node)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogbuji's method and Harold's method, since it would have allowed a user to specify specific nodes of a structured document to be used to generate a stylesheet.

As per dependent claim 2, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further discloses the method wherein the character string further includes a document ID (page 5, paragraphs 1-2: Here, a URL is used as a document ID).

As per dependent claim 3, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further discloses the method wherein accessing the document includes retrieving the document based on the document ID (page 5, paragraphs 1-2: Here, the URL is retrieved for the user documentation of the schema).

As per dependent claim 4, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method wherein a document ID is implied by prior state information (page 3, section "Location Paths": Here, based upon the prior state location, the root location path is implied. A user need only enter a "/" instead of entering an absolute path).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogbuji and Harold's method with Harold's

method, since it would have allowed a user to more quickly enter data through relative path names rather than encoding the entire absolute path names.

As per dependent claim 5, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further discloses the method wherein accessing the document includes accessing a data-object-model data structure in memory (pages 1-2: Here, a vehicle data-object-model, discloses the elements and attributes necessary for a vehicle data-object).

As per dependent claim 6, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further discloses the method wherein the path specification is compliant with any version of an XPath standard (page 3, paragraph 5).

As per dependent claim 7, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 7 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 8, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 8 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 9, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further discloses the method wherein the self-describing, structured document includes a document type, further including accessing a schema corresponding to the document type and validating application of the update operator and the update values at the path specification (page 3, paragraphs 4-5: Here, Schematron is a validating application using XPath as the path specification).

As per dependent claim 10, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9. Claim 10 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 11, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9. Claim 11 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 12, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further discloses a SOX standard (page 2, paragraph 5).

As per dependent claim 13, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 13 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 14, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 14 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 15, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further discloses the method further including accessing an element set list corresponding to a plurality of the update values to be applied at the path specification (page 5, paragraph 5: Here, the assert/report elements are to be applied to the elements specified in the path specification).

As per dependent claim 16, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15. Claim 16 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 17, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15. Claim 17 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 18, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15. Claim 18 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 19, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further discloses the method further including accessing a set of business processing rules corresponding to the document type and validating application of the update operator and the update values at the path specification (page 5, paragraphs 5-6: Here, a structured document specified by the path is validated against specified rules).

As per dependent claim 20, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 19. Claim 20 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 21, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 19, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further discloses the method wherein the business processing rules are Schematron-compliant (page 3, paragraph 4).

As per dependent claim 22, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 21. Claim 22 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 23, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 21. Claim 23 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 24, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method wherein a single update operator applies to a plurality of sets (page 7,

Art Unit: 2178

section "Wildcards": Here, a wildcard can be put into the regular expression to allow for the operation(s) contained in the expression to be applied to a plurality of data sets).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogbuji and Harold's method with Harold's method, since it would allowed a user to save time by grouping sets of data for processing instead of creating duplicate processing directives for each set.

As per dependent claim 25, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method wherein the update operator is implied and not explicit in the character string (page 7, section "Wildcards": Here, the template applied is "@" which is not an explicit declaration of a template. It uses a hash to determine the value for the template).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogbuji and Harold's method with Harold's method, since it would have allowed a user to more easily apply several operators to the data.

As per dependent claim 26, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method wherein the update operator specifies adding one or more update values as sibling nodes of the node identified (page 4, section "Child Element Location Steps": Here, the operator specifies applying the update values to nodes; page 11: Here, applying operators to siblings is disclosed).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogbuji and Harold's method with Harold's method, it would have allowed a user to quickly apply operators through a tree traversal function, rather than creating an update specifically for each node.

As per dependent claim 27, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 26, with the modification that the update is applied to the sibling after the node identified. Harold further discloses applying operators to the sibling after a node identified (page 11: Here, the following-sibling axis allows for the movement to the next sibling in a context). Claim 27 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 27, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 26, with the modification that the update is applied to the sibling after the node identified. Harold further discloses applying operators to the sibling after a node identified (page 11: Here, the following-sibling axis allows for the movement to the next sibling in a context). Claim 27 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 28, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 26, with the modification that the update is applied to the sibling before the node identified. Harold further discloses applying operators to the sibling after a node identified (page 11: Here, the preceding-sibling axis allows for the movement to the previous sibling in a context). Claim 28 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 29, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Harold further discloses the method wherein the update operator specifies adding one or more update values as

descendent nodes of the node identified (page 12: Here, the descendant axis allows for movement to the next descendant for processing).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogbuji and Harold's method with Harold's method, since it would have allowed a user to quickly apply operators through a tree traversal function, rather than creating an update specifically for each node.

As per independent claim 30, Ogbuji discloses a method for updating of self-describing, structured document, the method including:

- Receiving a request identifying a starting document and specifying a document to be generated from the starting document (page 6, section "Powered by XPath": Here, the code example calls a document in the second line; pages 7-8, section "Putting a Schematron Schema into Action": Here, a schema is defined in Schematron and is used to transform the schema into a validating stylesheet).
- Accessing at least first and second declarative transformations corresponding to the starting document and the specified document type (pages 5-8: Here, a document is sent through Schematron to generate a validating stylesheet. The document is further has the stylesheet applied to it in order to validate the document).
- Applying the first declarative transformation to the starting document, producing a resulting document of the specified document type (pages 5-8: Here, Schematron is applied to a document, producing a validating stylesheet).

Art Unit: 2178

- Applying the second declarative transformation to the resulting document, producing character string data including a plurality of:
 - Path specifications for nodes in the resulting document (page 6, section “Powered by XPath”: Here, Schematron uses the XPath specification to generate the validating stylesheet)
 - Starting value copied from the starting document for at least some of the nodes (pages 5-8: Here, the values of the Schematron document are copied and applied to generate the stylesheet)
 - Editable values for at least some of the nodes (pages 5-8: Here, values of the Schematron document are used based upon the report/assert elements of a rule)
- Responding to the request with the character string data (pages 5-8: Here, the character string data is used to generate the stylesheet for validation)
- Producing an updated resulting document corresponding to the updated version of the character data string (page 4, paragraph 2: Here, a template is created through the update of a Schematron document and the source document)

Ogbuji fails to specifically disclose:

- Receiving an updated version of the character string data

Harold discloses:

- Receiving an updated version of the character string data (page 7, section “Wildcards”: Here, a wildcard can be used to determine nodes to have a template

applied. Further, wildcards can specify specific transformations/stylesheets to apply to different nodes)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ogbuji's method and Harold's method, since it would have allowed a user to easily generate separate validating stylesheets for separate nodes within a document.

As per dependent claim 31, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2. Claim 31 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 32, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claim 32 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 33, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claim 33 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 34, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 5. Claim 34 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 35, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 35 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 36, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7. Claim 36 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 37, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 8. Claim 37 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 38, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 30, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further

Art Unit: 2178

discloses the method wherein the specified document type corresponds to a schema, further including validation the updated resulting document against the schema (page 3, paragraph 4: Here, Schematron validates a document through a schema specification).

As per dependent claim 39, Ogbuji and Harold disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 38, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Ogbuji further discloses the method wherein the specified document type and a chosen trading partner correspond to a set of business processing rules, further including validation the updated resulting document against the set of business processing rules (page 3, paragraph 4: Here, Schematron is a set of business processing rules, used to validate documents).

As per dependent claim 40, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 40 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 41, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 41 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

As per dependent claim 42, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 22. Claim 42 is similarly rejected under Ogbuji and Harold.

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Green US 20040205459A1: Discloses browser controlled scanning.

Art Unit: 2178

- Grefenstette et al. US 20040205448A1: Discloses meta-document management with document identifiers.
- Ayan US 20030088824A1: Discloses multilevel electronic mail communication programs.
- Lucovsky et al. US 20030041076A1: Discloses schema-based services.
- Maslov et al. US 20020156803A1: Discloses structured online documents.
- Ghani US 20020087592A1: Discloses file conversion system.
- Jamali US006243501B1: Discloses recognition of documents using layout attributes.
- Crandall et al. US005963641A: Discloses examining, verifying, correcting, and improving electronic documents.
- Greenfield et al. US005734916A: Discloses identifying and reporting object relationships.
- Moore et al. US20010056429A1: Discloses persistent archives.
- van der Vlist, Eric, "Comparing XML Schema Languages,": Discloses SOX.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00-3:30).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

KRS


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER